

Remarks

In response to the office action mailed August 11, 2004, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections and that the case pass to issue in light of the amendments above and the remarks below. By this paper, claim 1 has been amended, and no claims have been added or canceled. As such, claims 1-23 are pending.

The Examiner's rejections are as follows: (1) claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by UK 569,532 (hereinafter the UK patent); and (2) claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the UK patent in view of U.S.P.N. 4,568,106 to Yokoyama (hereinafter the Yokoyama patent).

The Examiner notes that claims 3-6, 8, 11-13, 15-16, and 18-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner further notes that claim 14 is allowed.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 17 and 23 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 17 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the UK patent. Independent claim 1 is the only rejected independent claim. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is patentable over the UK patent. In particular, UK patent fails to teach that the seat part is moved forward away from the backrest without altering a height of a rear portion of the seat part during the folding over of the backrest. Rather, the UK patent, as clearly shown in Figure 2, lowers a rear portion of the seat part when folding over of the backrest.


Rejection of Claim 1
Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the UK patent and the Yokohama patent. The Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references teach the limitations recited in independent claim 1, and therefore, claim 7, which depends from claim 1 and includes all the limitations thereof, is patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that each rejection has been fully replied to and traversed and that the case is in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if it would further prosecution of this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,
STANISLAW A. WIECLAWSKI

By 
John R. Buser
Reg. No. 51,517
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: 8-24-04

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351